DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 017 HE 005 577

TITLE	Master's Degree Psychologists. Report of a Conference.
INSTITUTION	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo. Mental Health Manpower Office.
PUB DATE	Jun 71
NOTE	57p.; Proceedings of a Conference cosponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and the American Psychological Association through its Task Force on Masters Level Education in Psychology
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); *Certification; Conference Reports; *Higher Education; *Masters Degrees; Professional Training; *Psychologists

ABSTRACT

This document reports the proceedings of a Conference on Technical-Professional Preparation of Psychologists at the Masters Level, held in San Diego, California, on April 30-May 1, 1971. Following the keynote address, a paper on accreditation and a paper on certification and licensing are presented. Group discussions concerning issues involved in master's level education in psychology are summarized. (MJM)

ED 092017

MASTER'S DEGREE PSYCHOLOGISTS

Report of a Conference

Co-sponsored by
WICHE — APA

HE 005 577

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

ED 092017

MASTER'S DEGREE PSYCHOLOGISTS

Report of a Conference

Co-sponsored by
WICHE — APA

June, 1971

Published by:

Mental Health Manpower Office
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P Boulder, Colorado 80302

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Keynote Address - THE AGE OF CONSCIOUSNESS T. George Harris, Editor, *Psychology Today*	4
ACCREDITATION OF MASTER'S PROGRAMS IN PSYCHOLOGY Ronald B. Kurz, Office of Educational Affairs, APA	14
ON CERTIFICATION AND LICENSING, Karl E. Pottharst, Chairman of the Committee on State Legislation, Board of Professional Affairs, APA	23
Small Group Reports	34
First Discussion Session	34
Group 1	34
Group 2	35
Group 3	36
Group 4	38
Second Discussion Session	40
Group 1	40
Group 2	41
Group 3	43
Group 4	44
Conference Resolutions	46
Participant List	48

INTRODUCTION

This document is an attempt to report the proceedings of a Conference on Technical-Professional Preparation of Psychologists at the Masters Level, held in San Diego, California, on April 30-May 1, 1971. The conference was co-sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and the American Psychological Association (APA) through its Task Force on Masters Level Education in Psychology. However, there is no way to convey, on the printed page, the interest and enthusiasm of the participants.

Psychologists with masters degrees have posed a problem for the APA for many years. The APA's response to the problem has been sporadic and ineffective. The history of this problem has been well researched by Dr. Paul Woods, and was presented to the conference participants. Dr. Woods' paper has been omitted from these proceedings, since it will be published in the *American Psychologist* in August, 1971.

The conference was stimulated by the success of a similar effort co-sponsored by the Southern Region Education Board and APA. This southern conference, covering 14 states, was held in Atlanta, Georgia, on November 11-12, 1970. Dr. Charles Thomas, Chairman of the APA Task Force, suggested a western conference to cover the 13 states in the WICHE region. The conference was planned by WICHE staff and representatives of the APA Task Force. A tentative agenda was developed, and letters of invitation prepared. An invitation was sent to the chairman of the psychology department in every college or university offering either a bachelors or masters degree. Doctoral program representatives were not invited.

In all, 31 colleges and universities from nine states paid the expenses for 36 individuals to attend the conference. Numerous calls were received objecting to the dates of the conference, pointing out that they conflicted with, or were close to, regional and state psychology conventions.

This publication includes the keynote address given by T. George Harris, editor of *Psychology Today*, a paper on accreditation presented by Ronald B. Kurz, Associate Educational Affairs Officer of APA, and a paper on certification and licensing by Karl E. Pottharst, Chairman of the Committee on State Legislation, Board of Professional Affairs, APA.

Given this input, the conference participants were divided into four groups to facilitate discussion of the issues involved in masters-level education in psychology. These groups met together at two different times. Recorders in each of the four groups were assigned the task of preparing written summaries of the content of the discussions. These summaries were prepared on the spot and in very little time. These summaries, unedited, are presented in this report. While not as polished as their authors would prefer, they indicate more of the flavor of the discussion than would a more perfect version.

During the conference, the APA came under concerted attack for many reasons. It should be emphasized that the APA was largely responsible for this conference and was seeking information from those at the "grass roots" or on the "firing line." In this instance, at least, APA was willing to invite and suffer attack in order to obtain information essential to promoting a change in the organization.

Dr. Judith Cates, Research Associate, Manpower Studies, Educational Affairs Office, Dr. Michael Wertheimer, Educational Affairs Office, the APA Task Force chaired by Dr. Charles Thomas, Chairman,

Center for the Study of Racial and Social Issues, all deserve thanks for providing the opportunity for this conference.

Dan Payne, Director
Mental Health Manpower Office

Keynote Address - THE AGE OF CONSCIOUSNESS

T. George Harris
Editor, *Psychology Today*

I'm thoroughly unqualified for my assigned job: to join your discussion of the programs for graduate degrees in psychology. Since journalism is the second-lowest trade, I'm not qualified as a para-professional. But ignorance never stops an editor, and my reservations about the present system go back a few years. Like every red-blooded American since Horace Greeley, I believed completely in the educational system and in the upper reaches of heaven occupied by M.A.'s and Ph.D.'s. It was David Riesman--he doesn't have a doctorate, you know--who insisted that I read Michael Young's *The Rise of the Meritocracy*. The book is, as you know, thoroughly corrosive. It simply extrapolates the traditional notion of the good, university-certified world--right on out to its absurdity. In *Meritocracy*, the credentialing process not only helps build the ultimate bureaucratic society, but it becomes an active instrument of social suppression. Young's book should have prepared us all--though it, of course, did not--for the healthy critique now coming from Dr. Charles Thomas and other black psychologists.

A doctrine of scarcity haunts the present debate over the role of the psychologist. The job market is tight this year; to many a young Ph.D. opportunity does indeed look scarce. The society does not, at the moment, seem to have urgent need for him or her. And the surveys showing future demands do not seem convincing, in part because they have little to say about what a psychologist actually does. Indeed, we seem to spend a good deal of energy arguing over what psychologists should <u>not</u> do. Academic psychologists have reservations about what the

clinical people do, and the converse is also true. In fact, I started to dedicate today's talk to APA President George Albee. My title was to be: "The Short, Unhappy Life of Scientific Psychology."

These internecine stabbings would change in character, I believe, if we had a practical vision of the function psychology already fulfills in the culture, and of the size and variety of the jobs just ahead. Perhaps it takes an outsider, a sub-professional, to notice the radical shift in the behavioral scientist's relation to his culture. He has moved from out on the fringes to the middle of the action. Obvious forces are at work to change the credentialing of psychologists from an elitest activity designed to restrict entry and standardize around a few norms into an exciting effort to expand the range and variety of preparations needed for psychologists to become the chief intercessors in the cultural machinery.

First, let's take a quick look at the university, that embattled center where it is hard to see through the smoke. Peter Drucker has come closer than anyone else to spotting the historic new development in university life. In *The Age of Discontinuity*, Drucker brings his unorthodox and acute knowledge of history to bear on the relationship between education and work. Since the beginning of specialization in labor, he points out, most work has demanded skill learned on the job. Only the clerks and professionals had to be educated. But in the present culture, the ordinary worker depends primarily upon knowledge gained by formal education. Drucker talks of the knowledge economy, the knowledge worker, the knowledge society. He proves his point out of his own intimate involvement with almost every form of public and private organization.

If Drucker is right--and I'm convinced he is--then the knowledge-dispensing center is the economic core of the culture. For the moment at least, the chief dispenser is the university. It thus has enormous

economic influence upon the lives of many. As we all know, failure to gain admission to the university virtually assigns an individual to a permanent sub-cast down among the less sophisticated machines.

One consequence, Drucker argues, is violence. He makes a rather detailed comparison between recent violence in all industrialized states and that found in most cities during the early days of the industrial revolution. His idea grabs you. The industrial revolution shifted the core of life from the church to the factory. Rural institutions that had been organized around the cathedral had to be reorganized around the factory smokestack. In the process, the social machinery went through a period of such disorder that riots became the order of the day. Much the same process is now at work as urban life is being reorganized around the knowledge center, not the factory.

Ten years ago, George B. Leonard and I made fools of ourselves by saying that education had become such an urgent need that people would soon do violence to each other in their fight over the quality of education. We took no pride in being proved right much earlier than we had expected. The urban riots around public schools, no less than the gas guns on campus, tell us that education is no longer just the escalator for the ambitious. It is the necessity for ordinary citizens--unless they happen to be the children of the very rich and can afford to drop out. Nor can the university afford to hold itself apart from the community surrounding it; in the knowledge culture, it is like the rich feasting while the poor gaze on. The struggle at Columbia, it seems to me, indicates that the urban community will tear down the walls, or encourage their confederates inside the walls to do the job, unless they have a share in the wealth of knowledge. A university that single-mindedly carries on its dedication to learning without concern for the people around it--one that truly becomes ivory tower--is very much like the strip coal mining company that destroys the landscape. Both organizations are fulfilling their stated mission without concern for the consequences in the surrounding community.

The political reduction of university funding has to be seen in this context. The American faith in education for its own sake was building an enormous plant, literally hundreds of independent fortresses, that moved toward the European model of the elite place. The last few years of riot and fund-cutting have made it clear, not that the university is any less regarded, but that it must fulfill its role in the community if it is to gain the necessary concensus for ever-rising public and private funding. I suspect that we are also about to witness a major expansion in alternative educational institutions, some of them pioneered by the counter-culture, but most of them developed and expanded by more patient groups in the private, public and non-profit sectors.

This workaday function of knowledge has changed the shape of the university itself. Traditional humanities, the mark of the educated upper-middle and upper class citizen, have given way to the more utilitarian and egalitarian disciplines, mainly the behavioral sciences. In the post-war period, sociology, anthropology and psychology have become the core of a liberal education. By 1977, the BASS report shows, social sciences will account for about a third of all majors at the bachelor's level. My worry is that psychology departments will continue to be so busy with this continued growth in the teaching function--in what David Riesman calls the W.P.A. side of education--that they will fail to prepare people for the much more urgent needs outside the university.

The character of those external needs arises directly from the peculiar demands of our time. The spread of technology has, I think, been widely misunderstood by futurists such as Herman Kahn. Most of them have a tendency to look at separate pieces of gadgetry, assume that each piece will soon come into wide usage and then dream up a world organized around such gadgets. The laser beam is a favorite example. This approach is wrong for several reasons, I believe, one of them being the assumption of a permanent acceleration principle in

technology. There is considerable evidence of an actual slowdown in basic technical innovation. Herb York argues that the rate of innovation has already slowed down. The laser, he points out, is the last major innovation. And since we now bring new devices into use much faster than we used to, the acceleration of the past quickly becomes deceleration.

We are beginning instead to concentrate upon the impact of the innovations that have already taken place. As they have changed the historic relationship between man and his work, so the rise of technology has changed the relationship between man and nature. After centuries of fighting to conquer mother nature, man has won unconditional surrender. We now create, or destroy, the environment we live in. As Harvard theologian, Harvey Cox, argued in his milestone book, *The Secular City*, man is now the creator--especially in that ultimate human artifact, the city, where the landscape is concrete and the rivers are highways.

It would seem, then, that The Bomb is only one symbol of man's new power over his own destiny, perhaps not the most important symbol. The central fact is that human behavior has gained both a daily and a final meaning that it did not have before. We cannot leave it to chance or tradition or accident or providence or any of the other comforting rationalizations of the past. We have come into a time when we must be daily and deeply concerned with the consequences of human behavior. We demand of ourselves and of others that we be conscious of our actions. I'm not arguing for rationality; in fact, we're less in an age of reason than in an age of consciousness.

Let's take an example from a related discipline--the dismal science of economics. In the "new economics," there was nothing that is new in the technical sense; John Maynard Keynes wrote it all in his *General Theory*. The new economics is simply a political awareness that the standard Democratic-Republican arguments about the size of government

are not important. What matters is that we have in the Federal Government the fiscal and monetary instruments to control the level of economic activity, which means we can control the number of jobs, the spread of affluent incomes and the side-effects of prosperity. Given this political awareness of such powers, we are forced to use them. A negative decision--an attempt to dodge by going back to the "laws" of economics--is itself a decision.

In this and other fundamental matters, we are forced to make collective and individual choices that we once could leave to prayer or a roll of the dice. There's an obvious parallel between the new economics and the impact of the atomic bomb; since total war (i.e., betting our misunderstandings on one big roll of the dice) is no longer a viable alternative, we are forced to figure out how to live with our neighbor's behavior, no matter how he may bug us.

All this seems rather distant from the role of the psychologist, but indeed here is what brings the world to his door. B. F. Skinner sees the problem more clearly than any other psychologist I know. His new book, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, is a sort of summing up. He argues that man, while determined by his environment, has the conscious capacity to re-design that environment so as to revise human behavior. All the world's a Skinner box, and the shaping is urgent. For instance, quick aggression and instant sexual response had survival value during man's physiological evolution, but today they are counterproductive. Though I find myself shaken by Skinner's deliberate attack upon the tradition of freedom and human dignity--he sees these beliefs as the barrier to environmental redesign--I cannot help but admit that he has recognized the size of the problem. We can no longer leave human behavior to the accidents of culture, he argues. To do so now is to invite destruction of the species in which we have considerable interest.

And so we are entering The Age of Conscious Action. Since the psychologist, whatever his idealogy or sub-discipline, is the expert in consciousness, it is his age. We are, in fact, well into many techniques by which we shape our own beh vior. For instance, the group movement amounts at one level to the egalitarianization of Freud's couch. The knowledge of self that was once restricted to the affluent few can, with the help of a few thousand facilitators, become available to almost everyone in the culture.

Beyond that economic fact about the Rogers movement, lies an intriguing thing of the spirit. The group ethic calls forth a sort of glorious ambition: it's not enough to act decently toward others; we have to be decent inside ourselves. We take responsibility for things once left to the unconscious. An inversion becomes clear. While humanistic psychologists think of themselves as freeing people to be irrational and spontaneous, they achieve an opposite result. The conscious zone is expanded. If anything serious happens on the couch or in the group, it is that we expand our conscious or cognitive control into areas once left to chance, the id, the anima or early toilet training.

The chief business of most psychologists can be described in similar language: the expanding of conscious activity. Let's take testing, for instance. To the extent that psychological testing is still financed and controlled by the major institutions, it is a screening-out device that lets administrators consciously set standards, often silly ones, for the kind of talent needed in special institutions. But we are rapidly moving, I believe, to the day when the tables will be turned: the people being tested are learning to use testing for their own self-assessment. Here is a function of testing that the most militant black psychologist can cheer, because it allows the person tested to use the instrument rather than be manipulated by it.

David McClelland has shown us the next step. After 15 years of working on motivation testing, he came to realize that the testing instrument could be used as an instrument of self-change. In India, he taught people to manipulate their fantasies--which he had measured with his TAT--and in the process to transform their motivational pattern. In effect, McClelland has discovered ways by which people can re-create themselves, can consciously change their motivational patterns to fulfill their concepts of their role in society.

Similar results are beginning to appear in many other areas of psychological research. In drug therapy and bio-feedback, we are beginning to see very specific behavioral effects. Once we apply to humans the precision already achieved with animals, we will be able, I believe, not only to cure many cardiovascular diseases, but gain conscious control over the stress that has become the most agonizing side effect of urban life. What the alpha-wave controls will mean, I'll leave to the religious groups who are so fascinated by their mystic possibilities. But it is no accident that psychology, often to its embarrassment, has become the chief source of new religious experiences.

In the interface chores of applied psychology, we are beginning for the first time to get an honest body of activists. The use of consumer behavior research by the FTC to prove its case against advertisers shifts the balance. Such research will continue to be used as an instrument for deliberate creation of new products and marketing systems, but it will also be used to police such systems in the interest of the consumer.

Perhaps the main thrust of applied psychology is now in community organization. The black psychology movement is giving community psychology a valid respect for the development of individual and ethnic differences. We may yet see a culture in which the standardizing

pressures for acculturization--putting us a'l in the WASP straight jacket--will be replaced by a more humanistic ideal: We may yet learn how to cultivate and celebrate our differences. Somewhat the same kind of effect is beginning to appear in organizational sociology and social psychology. With the rise of what Warren Bennis calls organic populism, the psychologist is beginning to work on deliberate creation of institutions that will be less destructive than today's bureaucracies.

I don't mean to sound optimistic. Each time I suggest an activity in which psychologists are trying to improve things, I am also suggesting that the situation has grown bad enough--and will get worse--to invite deliberate intercession; in many cases, the psychologist will make things worse. The horrors of today's public housing and welfare programs can, I believe, be traced to a rather autocratic line of social thought out of psychology. White middle-class professionals had an unconscious and implacable impulse to keep black people poor and poor--as if they were last noble savages who could not be allowed to join the rat-race. The solution does not lie in backing away, however, but in making such impulses conscious and therefore manageable.

We have lost our innocence in many new areas. To learn that WASPs have certain patterns of action and thought forces us, if we are WASPs, to reject or accept those patterns consciously. The behavioral scientists have backed most of the culture--and themselves, says Alvin Gouldner--into the consciousness corner. On one presidential commission after another, sociologists and psychologists are bringing conventional wisdom into doubt by showing the counter-productive effects of many policies. My favorite among such findings came from the pornography commission. The data indicated that if you would have your child grow up healthy--not be a deviant who assaults little children in the park--you must see that he gets a normal diet of what has long been called pornography.

And so we see the wayward psychologist being called into almost every activity of the society. Skinner's behavior modifiers, having set up token economies in dozens of institutions, are now invading the accounting system. Here is a Skinner box with which they can consciously shape the behavior of millions. In education, the struggle over teaching methods as well as over the character of the classroom depends heavily upon fast observation by the educational psychologist; in the knowledge culture, these are increasingly urgent matters. The group movement now sets off the harsh controversy--one that quickly gets into arguments over whether man is basically good or evil--in most churches and many other institutions. And throughout the culture, the psychologist holds up the mirror so that, as George Miller argues, people get a new perception of themselves and thus are driven to change both themselves and the society.

In such a time, Mr. Chairman, the leaders of psychology must, of course, be concerned with the quality of training for people who are called psychologists. But the much more urgent concern, in this age of conscious action, must be for creating the numbers and varieties of psychologists so urgently needed in the years ahead. The demands that the culture is beginning to put upon us argues for diversity, involvement and courage. The greatest risks are those induced by over-caution. Thank you.

ACCREDITATION OF MASTER'S PROGRAMS IN PSYCHOLOGY

Ronald B. Kurz
Office of Educational Affairs
American Psychological Association

When I was asked to talk to you about accreditation of master's degree programs, I was mildly apprehensive. I felt the matter was so simple that there was little I could say beyond the following: APA currently accredits at the doctoral level. We feel we have a good rationale for that enterprise. We have procedures that work, criteria which seem to make sense, and perhaps most important of all, the doctoral accreditation program is accepted by the field--at least programs are paying their accreditation fees and APA does not lose too much money on the operation. If we feel it is important for doctoral programs, and if it works reasonably well, why not accredit at the master's level and approach it the same way? A little thought and a few conversations with my colleagues convinced me that the situation with respect to master's programs is not so simple. That is, I think we should accredit master's programs and for much the same reasons we accredit doctoral programs, but it will have to look quite different from what we currently do on the doctoral level if it is going to work.

What do we do at the doctoral level now? Briefly this: The Committee on Accreditation, which is a committee of the Education and Training Board, accepts applications for accreditation from doctoral programs in clinical, counseling and school psychology. The application provides information on the goals and philosophy of the program, the staff, the students, the curriculum, the facilities, the support from the administration and the general climate in the institution. If all

is in order, a site visit to the program is made by a team representing the Committee. The team usually consists of three psychologists chosen from the ranks of the directors of training programs and department chairmen, and occasionally a member of the Committee on Accreditation or a Central Office staff person. After the visit, the team writes a report which evaluates the program in the areas covered in the application - goals, staff, students, curriculum, etc. The report is sent to the institution for review and comments. Then the Committee on Accreditation meets to consider both the report of its visiting team and the comments on the report by the institution. An accreditation decision is then made, and, if it is positive, the name of the institution appears on the list published in the *American Psychologist*. Following this initial accreditation there are annual reports by the institution to the Committee giving changes and developments in the program, and site visits at a maximum of five-year intervals.

Before we consider the appropriateness of this model for master's level accreditation, there are some very immediate and practical considerations to discuss first. APA carries out its accreditation of doctoral programs under the aegis of the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA) which controls university accrediting by recognizing certain accrediting agencies as having responsibility for specific areas. In a sense, we are accredited by NCA to carry out our accreditation program. We currently have permission from NCA to accredit only at the doctoral level. In order to begin accrediting at the master's level, we would have to seek permission from NCA, providing, in detail, the evidence that there is a need for it and that the field actually wants it. We would have to spell out the implications it would have for our accreditation at the Ph.D. level and analyze the effect of master's level accreditation upon Ph.D. training in professional areas of psychology. The point is that we cannot begin accrediting at the master's level in the immediate future. We would have to be licensed by NCA to do so. However, I believe we could get such a license if we really want it.

Another practical problem is the expense and administrative complications involved in accrediting at the master's level. Our current Ph.D. and internship accreditation costs in excess of $100,000 a year. Seventy-five percent of that expense is shared by the accredited programs in the form of accreditation fees and the rest is paid by APA. In terms of personnel, three people at Central Office spend full time on accreditation, while more than two hundred site visitors are drawn from the field. There is also the Committee on Accreditation which meets regularly to do nothing else but deal with accreditation issues, and there is the E&T Board which has overall responsibility for developing accreditation policy. When you also consider the time and money each institution spends on preparing reports, corresponding with us at Central Office, preparing for visits and entertaining site visitors in the style to which they have become accustomed, you will easily see that our present accreditation program is a rather complex, costly and time consuming operation for APA, as well as for the accredited institutions. Now, it is safe to assume that there will be many more master's programs than doctoral. Furthermore, the diversity of programs will probably be far greater among master's programs than doctoral. It appears to me, then, that if we approach master's program accreditation using the same model we have been using for doctoral accreditation, we will be faced with a monumental financial and administrative headache for both APA and the individual institutions.

Be these immediate and practical matters as they may, I would like to consider some broader issues which I believe amount to a rationale for master's level accreditation. I will then propose a model for such accreditation.

The first issue about which we should be concerned is the legitimizing of master's programs. I strongly believe that accreditation adds to the legitimacy of programs. It tells the public, employers, students, and federal, state and local government agencies that psychology,

represented by its national organization, recognizes the person trained at the master's level as a legitimate psychologist, one who is properly trained to perform certain functions as a psychologist which will be useful to society. I think this is a very important point. If we accredit at the master's level, it commits us to recognizing the products of the accredited programs as trained psychologists. While accreditation is not the only approach to legitimization, it is a significant one.

In legitimizing master's level psychologists, however, we must be concerned with psychology's own protection. We must make certain that master's level psychologists are trained as we believe psychologists ought to be trained. Psychologists should have control over their own development. Accreditation of master's programs would offer this kind of control and protection through the development of criteria for evaluation, the selection and training of site visitors, and the feedback offered to programs after the visits.

This function of accreditation to protect and control psychology's own destiny is the source, however, of some of the sharpest criticism of accreditation - criticism with which any new model for master's accreditation will have to deal. In protecting psychology's development and integrity, there is the real danger that accreditation will stifle growth and development of innovations, and will discourage diversity of goals. While these are important issues to any accreditation program, I think they are vital to the development of master's programs. I say this because I believe that master's programs will have to be encouraged to develop a far greater diversity of goals and approaches to these goals than doctoral programs. To be effective, master's programs will have to train people for local needs. While doctoral programs have, for the most part, had national goals, the master's programs should most probably have local ones. For example, a master's training program in Los Angeles should look quite different from one in Missoula, Montana.

Accreditation must not stand in the way of such diversity, but should encourage it. Furthermore, programs should be encouraged to engage in responsible experimentation based on their own goals, rather than looking to some national standard of training which might be totally inappropriate in specific locales.

Another issue related to the legitimization function of accreditation is the assurance it affords various consuming publics that the products of accredited programs are properly trained. There are several publics we have to be concerned with. There are first of all the students. Accreditation of master's programs should tell them when they enter the program, that they will have a faculty which is stable, competent, sufficient in numbers, and diverse enough in point of view and approach to train them properly; they and their fellow students will be selected and evaluated appropriately and according to some fair standard; there will be a curriculum organized properly around some specific and clearly stated goals; there will be adequate facilities for carrying out the objectives of the program; the administration of the institution will continue to support the program; and high standards will be maintained in the future so that they will have degrees which will maintain their worth over time. To be maximally useful to students, accreditation should give them information on all of these points. I am not certain that our current model, which provides only a global statement of approval, really gives the students what they need to know. I would hope that accreditation at the master's level will be able to do more.

The other broad public to which accreditation must be accountable is the public which consumes our services - the employers of psychologists at agencies, those who receive direct services from psychologists, and more generally, the public which supports psychological training in the form of training grants paid out of tax dollars. While accreditation does tell each of these publics that in some general way the accredited programs will give them what they need and that their taxes

are a good investment, it is in this area that we again find accreditation getting a great deal of criticism. For in attempting to control its own destiny and integrity, psychology, through its accreditation, may not be as responsive as it should be to the needs of the various publics. Furthermore, since public funds for training are so often tied to accreditation, we must see to it that accreditation is accountable to the public. Again, I am not convinced that our current doctoral accreditation program is maximally accountable to the public, and I would wish that we could build greater accountability into master's accreditation.

Cutting through these issues is a very important function of accreditation - that is, to provide programs with a means for self-review and validation. I see this as probably the most significant benefit of accreditation to psychology in general, to the individual programs and to the public. The value of the ordinary site visit procedure, which brings peer outsiders in to help the program look at itself cannot be overestimated. It helps programs clean out the dark corners, to look at things from points of view they may never have considered, and to look at new ways of changing to keep ahead of the developments in the field. I am impressed with the way accreditation can help a program accomplish the job of self-review for positive change, and I would hope that master's level accreditation would be able to capitalize on this advantage.

I would like now to propose a model for master's accreditation which I believe would maximize the advantages of the approach we have been using for doctoral accreditation and minimize some of the serious problems and criticisms. I have in mind a set of procedures which would give maximum control to the institutions accredited to determine their own goals and methods and to decide by whom they will be reviewed. It would give maximum control to psychology over its own development, but at the same time be accountable to the various publics supporting

psychology. It would offer maximum information to students to help them choose the right program and to employers to help them choose the kind of people they want. It would result in minimum cost to the institutions and to APA, and minimum administrative headaches. In fact, to try to avoid some of the negative connotations of accreditation I propose a new label - objective self-review.

Objective self-review would be accomplished in this way. A Committee on Self-Review would develop guidelines for the evaluation of master's programs. This committee would be very similar in function and composition to the current APA Committee on Accreditation and the guidelines would probably look very similar to the criteria we now use for the evaluation of doctoral programs, except, of course, they would be developed specifically for master's programs.

Any master's program which felt it met these guidelines, or which wished to engage in objective self-review for the purpose of determining the quality of its training, or which needed guidance for the further development of its program would submit an application to the Committee on Self-Review. The application would provide information in the major areas of the guidelines - a statement of the goals of the training program, and the details of how these goals are reached in terms of faculty, students, curriculum, facilities, and support from the administration. The Committee would review the application and determine the kind of team of consultants which would be appropriate for review of the program. The Committee would then select a group of a dozen to 15 names of potential consultant-visitors from its files of site visitors who are familiar with the evaluation guidelines, and who could help the program review itself fairly and objectively. The list should include directors of programs, department chairmen, students, professional psychologists who are not directly in the academic field, and non-psychologists who are in some way associated with the mental health field. The list would be sent to the applying institution and they would be instructed to select

three or four consultant site visitors from the list, to make contact with them, to arrange the visit to their own program, to pay for the expenses of the visitors and perhaps provide them with a small honorarium, and to make certain that a final report on the institution was written. In other words, the program takes care of all the arrangements and expenses associated with the review of its own program and has an important say in who shall help them do the reviewing.

The final report of the review team would be sent to the Committee on Self-Review and the institution would also submit its response to the report. At this point, the Committee may make an accreditation decision; however, I do not think this is really necessary in view of my next suggestion. I propose that the team reports and the comments on the reports by the institutions be published as a consumer's guide to master's programs for students and employers. The value of such a publication to students who are trying to select a graduate program and to employers who wish to nire a master's level psychologist would be enormous.

As is our current practice with our doctoral accreditation, each program would submit an annual report on its progress. If the annual report showed that problems are appearing in the program, the Committee would require a new Self-Review to update the report in the consumer's guide. Or a program may feel that it is changing so rapidly that its current report in the guide is out of date, and therefore, they would request a new review. In any case, all programs would be required to undertake a new review every five years and to update their reports in the guide accordingly.

The model I have been describing could be embellished in a number of ways. For example, programs could be required to send the reports, along with the usual descriptive brochures, to all students who request information on the program. In whatever way we chose to do it, however, I firmly believe that a system for accrediting, reviewing, evaluating,

or studying master's programs would be clearly in the best interests of the program, of psychology, of students, and of the various consuming publics.

ON CERTIFICATION AND LICENSING

Karl E. Pottharst
Chairman of the Committee on State Legislation
Board of Professional Affairs, APA

I would like to do two things today. First, I would like to give a quick review of programs of educational preparation at the Masters level in the Western States as they exist now, and second, I would like to relate the opportunities for Masters level training programs to some of the problems and standard setting on the legislative scene.

Patricia Keith-Spiegel at the San Fernando Valley State College, in an article soon to appear in the *Journal of Professional Psychology* on "Masters Level Training in the Western States", provides a baseline of some facts on where Masters level education is now in Psychology. The article indicates that there are forty-eight academic settings in the Western States providing terminal Masters level education in Psychology. There are several different training programs within each setting, providing a total of eighty-four different programs embraced by the forty-eight settings. The majority of these programs (twenty-five of them) consists of programs in General Experimental Psychology; nineteen of the programs are for specialization in Clinical Psychology (this is the second largest category); thirteen of the programs are in School Psychology; six specialize in Industrial or Human Factor Psychology. The remainder of the categories with four, three, two, or one programs in each category are made up of specialties such as Educational Psychology, Developmental, Humanistic,

Junior College Teaching, Psychometry, Physiological, Social, Community, etc. Four general programs had no explicit specialization emphasis at all.

The first point I would like to make about the specialization in programs as they exist, is that, of the eighty-four programs, forty-four of them are in the areas of either General Experimental or Clinical and Counseling where the journeyman degree, the qualifying degree, is at the Doctorate and not at the Masters level. Let's take the General Experimental area first.

I think it is safe to say that there really are no occupational, vocational, or professional employment opportunities at the Masters level in Experimental Psychology except as a research assistant or as a teacher or professor in an academic setting. In the area of Clinical and Counseling Psychology, although we keep hearing of figures that indicate that one-third of the positions in Clinical Psychology across the country are at the Masters level, nonetheless, the fact remains that the recognized standard of educational preparation in clinical and in counseling is at the Doctorate level. People at the Doctoral level are in administrative positions, consultative positions, and other positions with more responsibility and status. These are the facts. So you can see that the bulk of the existing Masters level programs of educational preparation seems to be the kind of programs that are, despite the fact that they are "terminal" Masters level programs, training people who will be expected to go on and obtain their Ph.D.'s.

I would like also to point out a singular fact that we are all aware of. This fact pertains to the goals and the values of the people who for many years have been in leadership and administrative positions in the state colleges and elsewhere, where Masters level

educational preparation has gone on. Despite the fact that the innovative heresy of truly terminal Masters level educational preparation will not stay repressed but persists in surfacing from time to time, the most dearly held value of those conducting such programs seems to be the scholar-scientist model at the Doctorate level that they emulate in the universities. So much so that in many settings the student who is remembered is the one who has exited with his Masters Degree and who has been accepted at one of the larger well-known Doctoral training programs in universities, where perhaps the people who are on the faculty of the Masters level program would prefer to be. I gather that this conference today is based upon an emerging current of direction that represents a sharp departure from this established precedent. That is, many of you here are aiming at developing programs of educational preparation at the Masters level from which graduates will be equipped to go out into various settings in society and utilize psychological knowledge and skills in a variety of specific kinds of tasks, including, but not necessarily limited to, research tasks and clinical and counseling tasks as we are familiar with them.

In the light of this, I believe that the new programs that we are talking about, then, will more honestly and more responsibly fulfill their responsibilities to students as well as to society than the ones in the past that we are familiar with.

I will now turn to the legislative and standard setting area in relationship to new developments in Masters level training. There are problems here, and there are opportunities here. In order to fully understand what some of these problems and opportunities are in regards to our own standard setting, I think it is necessary to become somewhat of what Frederick Wyatt at the University of Michigan used to call "The Sunday Morning Sociologist in Psychology." That is,

we need to become aware of our own social processes within our own professional organizations and our own standard setting activities in order to get some objectivity on what has been happening within our organizations and standard setting boards and commissions over the last ten or fifteen years.

Over the last fifteen, even the last twenty-five years, there has been wave after wave of standard-setting activities, in accreditation, in professional associations, in membership and ethics, and in licensure and certification. Standards have been defined, professional and scientific groups have committed themselves to these standards, regulatory boards and commissions have been established to protect these standards. Having done this out of our experience based on the precedents and on what have become our traditions, we in a measure have become an establishment. Our standard-setting groups become little establishments. It is not a derogation to point this out. It is simply a descriptive fact about our standard-setting behaviours.

Anyone familiar with the psychology of Psychology Examining Boards in the state will recognize that, inasmuch as the Boards maintain the standards according to which people who are coming into the state or newly pledged graduates are evaluated and subsequently given sanction and legitimacy to be called Psychologists and to function in Society, these boards and commissions become more concerned, of necessity, about holding on to what they have, rather than considering what changes might be necessary in order to face the future. With this background, now let us take a look at the legislation governing standards in Psychology in the fifty states. Forty-four of these states have mandatory licensing or certification laws. Thirty-three of these laws have been brought in legislatively during the past ten years--that is, in the 1960's.

In about half a dozen states, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Massachusetts, Iowa, Vermont, South Dakota, psycholgists are still fighting the certification-licensing battle and, in the interim, they are operating under voluntary certification. Of the forty-four states that have the mandatory licensing legislation, within the language of the law, seven of these states give cognizance to the Masters Degree. However, in every case, except one (Minnesota), they give cognizance to the Masters Degree only as the academic degree that accords with the role of the Psychological Examiner.

If you look at the statutes within these states, you will see that they very heavily bear the imprint of what we have become familiar with under the slogan of the Medical Model. That is, the years during which these statutes were written were the years during which Psychological services and the people who were deriving the standards were defining themselves and what they did in an atmosphere borrowed from the Medical Model which is the one defining what they did in terms of therapy and diagnosis. In their definition of things, the examiner was the person who did the psychological diagnosis or examination. The full professional was the person who did psychotherapy, consultation, research, administration, and the other things associated with full professional functioning. In other words, there is a clear implication of a second-class citizenry quality for the Masters level person so defined.

It would seem that we are standing at the point where it is just possible that this type of regulatory legislation, in regards to the limitations that it placed upon the Masters level functioning, is drawing to a close. We are approaching a point in time where other alternatives of socially desirable, needed, and useful activity for Masters level trained people will be available as new options in society.

The period of legislation and standard setting activity is drawing to a close at a time when practically all the states have defined the prerogatives and initiatives at the Doctoral level. Hardly has this era drawn to a close when we begin to hear the clamor in the air and on the winds for other kinds and other directions in training. Circumstances are bringing it about that more and more people are looking toward sub-doctoral trained people to provide services and to advance knowledge in a variety of settings. Paraprofessional training, Masters level training, Bachelors level training, all of these are included in various ways in the beginnings of new directions of educational preparation in human services, behavioral sciences, and mental health training programs. Some of the factors that have brought about an awareness of the need of these new directions are an increasing awareness of the limitations of the Doctoral level scientist-professional model in professional preparation, the realization that the level of support and commitment to Doctoral level programs being what it has been over the last ten years will never produce sufficient numbers of people to carry out the tasks in service programs than an increasingly impatient society needs.

If we look back over the last twenty years, we realize, as one of the speakers this morning has reminded us, that this is not the first time that the need for Masters level training was made evident. What can we do to prevent the awareness of the need for effective sub-doctoral training programs at the Masters and other levels from getting completely lost and submerged again? It is possible that this will happen. What can we do to prevent this from happening? We are doing some of the necessary things. We are keeping this awareness on the surface, out in the open. We are trying to make it a viable thing and moving it into actual implementation. We are holding regional conferences such as the one held in December in

Atlanta, such as the one held here today in San Diego.

But we must do other things besides hold conferences to stimulate interest. We must find ways of stimulating changes in the national, regional, and state level standard-setting groups, to open up ways for them to make themselves aware and educate themselves as to the need for revisions of standards with the right kind of safeguards, and if necessary provide supervision in certain specific areas to provide for the licensing of Masters level people. This will not come easily or quickly, but if we are to be effective and if the whole interest and enthusiasm and movement is not to lose its impetus, we must do this as well as what we are doing today.

Recently, the National Executive of the Association of Psychology Examining Boards discussed setting up a task force within the Psychology Board Association on the future impact of Masters level training. As Chairman of APA's Legislative Committee, I have invited him to collaborate with us in launching a survey of the fifty states plus the District of Columbia regarding the perceptions of the Psychology Examining Board of the likely short-term and long-range future impact of newly developing paraprofessional, Bachelors, and Masters level training programs in psychological knowledge and skills.

Particularly in some of the larger, more densely populated states where the kinds of problems that are being faced are harbingers of the problems that will be faced up ahead in some of the other states, we find, in New York and California, for example, that practicing groups, like clinical social workers, school psychologists, rehabilitation counselors, marriage counselors, etc., are seeking and successfully obtaining independent legislative

recognition at the Masters level. The survey I spoke about will hopefully tell us how much of this is going on in some of the other states, like Illinois, Michigan, Florida, and so on.

The choice before state professional associations and psychology examining Boards seems to be fairly clear. Either they make provisions within their standard setting for these new professional groups, like school psychologists, marriage counselors, rehabilitation counselors, etc., or these groups will autonomously develop their own associations and get their own legislation outside of the label of Psychology.

Another force that has been operating to bring about an awareness of the need for change within the standard-setting groups within our field, within our little establishments, is the criticism that comes of the shortcomings, the limitations in goals and in effectiveness of the kind of social regulation that independent licensing and certifying legislation provides in the health and human services professions. The criticisms, some of which are familiar, are that this type of social regulation tends to stifle innovation, to protect guilds' functions rather than the public interest, and to increase the cost of service rather than to hold it down. From an organizational and administrative standpoint, in some of the states like California and New Jersey, and I am sure in some of the other larger states, there has been criticism of the increasing tendency to multiply independent examining boards in the health professions.

This puts pressure upon our group, as it does upon the medical profession, to explore ways of consolidating within itself new professional groups at different levels of training that would otherwise become independent and function autonomously. What we are talking about is the problem of how to bring about social change

in the institutions that provide educational preparation in our field. Whom do we look to for leadership in initiating and leading us in this kind of social change in educational preparation? I recognize that in the point of view of objective, "Sunday Morning Sociology," regarding Psychological institutions, our professional organizations are little establishments, our Psychology Examining Boards are little establishments, the APA is an establishment, state colleges and university departments of psychology are establishments and are parts of larger establishments. If we are going to produce this kind of social change, we cannot wait for the establishments to move for us to go ahead. If we innovate, we innovate at our own risk. If we innovate, they are not going to show us the way. I heartily agree with Dr. Wood that we are tired of discussing and obsessing and producing position papers and recommendations.

The time has come for us to develop training programs that will provide the numbers and the kinds of people where psychological skills and knowledge are being "given away" to our students who can then go out into a variety of settings in society and "give it away" to societies, clients, patients, and institutions. This can be done at the Associate of Arts level with paraprofessional training and it can equally well be done at the Masters level, and ultimately at the Bachelors level.

I would hope that some of the people that innovate in Masters level training will team up with people who are training at the Doctoral level and at the Associate of Arts level and develop a curriculum ladder parallel to a career ladder. As many of you may know, this concept is built into the concept of the California School of Professional Psychology, which began taking classes of students at the high school and Masters degree level last September 9, who

upon graduation will respectively achieve the Associate of Arts Degree and the Ph.D. Degree in professional psychology. The people whom you will train will want mobility, they will not want to stay in the same setting, they will want social recognition, they will want to function in a way that will be difficult to distinguish from full independent Doctoral level responsibility and autonomy.

The future employers and personnel directors into whose programs--service programs, research programs, social action programs--your graduates will take positions, will want definite indications that the training programs are on a high level, that they are subject to the best criticism and review over time that the profession can provide, that standards of faculty selection, student selection, and program development are being met; and the only way this can be done is through an accreditation process. These people have a vital interest in investing their future careers in our educational preparation programs. Therefore, I think the necessity is clear in our planning of Masters level programs, as in all educational preparation programs, to involve representatives from standard-setting groups, licensing groups; to involve representatives from future employment groups from professionals in the community familiar with the settings into which graduating students will go; to involve representatives of the student groups themselves so that they may all make vital inputs.

A final word about specialists versus generalists emphasis in Masters level training. I believe we need both. We need specialists for making a valuable social contribution in a variety of fairly specific settings, such as School Psychology, Vocational Rehabilitation, Child Advocacy, Corrections and Probation, Marriage Counseling settings, etc. On the other hand, there is a need for people with broad training, who would be equally valuable in a variety of settings,

who would be able to make a contribution in a variety of different settings and perhaps in certain kinds of change facilitation, social action, certain kinds of action research, certain kinds of community psychology. During the next period of years, there is every reason to believe that priority will be given in distributing any available funds for training to innovative programs and certainly programs that will take less time and that will meet some of the criticisms of traditional programs. Such programs will stand a better change of being supported. Doctoral programs founded on the Boulder model and its variations, I believe, by and large, have been responsible to the national community, whereas the new Masters level programs and sub-doctoral level programs, it would appear, will have a greater chance of being effective through being responsible to regional areas and local areas.

To meet the training needs and the human services manpower needs of the 1970's, these new training programs will have to find a new allegiance. Instead of giving allegiance to the concept of training that is geared toward the scientist-professional model that places its highest value upon making contributions through knowledge, through research, the new allegiance can be to community service, and to the implementation of knowledge and skills and research methodology toward the solving of interpersonal and social problems.

SMALL GROUP REPORTS

The four small groups met independently on two separate occasions. As indicated earlier, the reports they prepared at that time are presented here in unedited form. The four reports are presented for the first session, followed by the four reports of the second session.

First Discussion Session

Group 1.

Group Leader: Dr. Paul Woods, Hollins College, Va.
Group Recorder: Dr. Felicia A. Pryor, Louisiana State Univ., La.

The consensus of our group is that MA trained people are legitimate psychologists who should be broadly trained as social change agents who are involved with and responsive to the needs of the community. They are viewed as a "new breed" of psychologically trained consultants to the community. Along with this commitment to produce a new type psychologist is the necessity for the trainers (i.e., you and me) to also be involved in social change in our training goals, methods, and institutions. Thus, there is a responsibility for us as trainers not only to respond to the tremendous need for human services, but also to be involved with those we are training to create actual career possibilities and a real professional identity.

Further, it was felt that psychology as a discipline does have a core of skills and knowledge that should be offered to the community as well as large groups of students who are anxious and able to respond

to those needs. If a core of such creatively involved, innovative people are produced, then pressure can be generated both in the local community and at a national level so that the competencies, skills, and professional identity of these people will have to be recognized. However, there was some question as to the advisability of involving this new type person in the whole issue of such things as the APA "old think" credential system. Instead, there was some feeling in this group that such creative, innovative social change agents should create an organizational structure of their own unhindered by the psychological "establishment." Others felt that psychology and APA would lose people who we should be committed to and of whom we should be proud. We should not disinfranchise them from ourselves. By using the model proposed by Kurz, it was felt that an external evaluative committee to advise and review, but not to set up either sanctions or training guides, could be effective. Also that these MA people, having been trained by psychologists in the discipline of psychology, should be accepted as full members of the professional psychological community.

Group 2.

Group Leader: Dr. James M. Whitehouse, Drake Univ., Iowa
Group Recorder: Dr. Henry Tomes, Meharry Medical College, Tenn.

Opening acquaintance process consisted of learning of programs and program involvement of participants in master's level education. The typical participant was a faculty person of the California State College System who was very involved in masters educational efforts. There was no typical program, but rather a diversity which ranged from highly innovative programs in terms of content and methods used, as well as traditional (classical?) masters programs. Diversity and innovation seemed, usually, to involve application of psychological knowledge and skills to persons and communities.

The question of need for such programs and persons was discussed. It was the consensus that in terms of need and actual job slots, that there was a need. For example, masters level persons could be employed in Jr. Colleges, conventional institutions, and schools.

Standard setting was briefly explored as a way of looking at program outputs. Essentially the group felt that this would limit discussion, but that issues related to licensing and accreditation must be entertained at some point. (Although institutionalized, it is also important to understand that states may vary a good deal on this point of licensing, etc.)

There was obviously consensus that the masters psychologists could be and are trained to take on professional-technical responsibilities. Also, it was thought masters programs could be tailored to produce a more general masters level professional or one who might be trained in a specific way for a particular area--i.e., behavioral modifications and "correctional psychologists."

A concern regarding the place of professional training brought out discussion of graduate v.s. professional school locus. It appeared, without a vote, that graduate programs are likely to be the producers of this professional group for some time. This group seemed to feel that removing professional psychology from its current university base would make it more difficult for research to be applied to social and community problems. (This group contained a number of quite vocal experimental psychology types.)

Group 3.

Group Leader: Dr. John F. Hale, Fort Lewis State College, Colo.
Group Recorder: Dr. Shalom E. Vineberg, Univ. of Houston, Tex.

I. Some conflict re: Skill training at MA level

A. Strong feeling for traditional grounding - irreducible, academic minimum.

1. Some question whether there ought to be any professional objective - study of behavior as the proper goal of curriculum.

2. Concern for overly narrow, readily obsolete training if based on specific skills. Danger of skills tied to specifically popular community problem.

II. Demand for psychologists at the MA level - existing and projected

A. Reasonable to expect demand in some areas, e.g.:
early child care
corrections
alcoholism and drug addiction
aging
educational settings
manpower upgrading
but no hard data on job market.

B. Also no data on the satisfaction and sense of adequacy of MA professionals now operating in community positions.

III. Responsibility of the university

A. Need college and community interface to determine community needs and program objectives.

1. How much responsibility should faculty assume for placement of graduates? (Some disagreement within group)

2. To what extent should MA be professional entry point - graduates should have the option of employment and continuing (immediately or later) to the doctorate.

3. Theory, research and practice - two views:

   a. Theory is a proper basis for professional practice.

   b. Experience with human problems in the community provides the material and the impetus for research and theory. This is a meaningful progression for students.

IV. There are many types of MA programs. Many will not be professionally oriented. Some clarifying statements and distinctions need to be made, not only in reference to professionally oriented programs, but to the others as well. In other words, critical, ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs is desirable.

Group 4.

Group Leader: Dr. Robert B. Kurz, Office of Educational Affairs
Group Recorder: Dr. Judith Cates, Research Associate, Manpower Studies, Office of Educational Affairs

I. Demand for Masters Level Psychologists

A. Can they find jobs? (Experience seemed to vary.)

B. What is the role of faculty? Consensus that faculty must convince possible employers that the products of their programs

are useful. (Also APA and state associations have a role to play.) Faculty need to convince conventional employers that some of their job qualifications are outdated, e.g., heavy emphasis on testing.

C. An unfilled demand in non-metropolitan or rural areas which the universities are not meeting.

D. Untouched populations, e.g., Chicano youth, elderly, Indian.

II. Obstacles to Development of New Programs

A. Resistance within psychology faculties. These resistances may become so great that the department actually splits up.

B. General administrative resistance to change; prevalent system of rewarding contact hours is not conducive to professional education.

C. Shortage of outside (federal) funding for developmental activities required to build new programs.

III. Program Model - Interdisciplinary and Community

A. Interdisciplinary:

1. Resistances within department and college may be countered by forming alliances with sociology, anthropology, political science, etc.

2. School psychology which is ostensibly interdisciplinary has, in many cases, been lost to Education.

B. Community

1. School Psychologist (once the clinical-testing role is given a lower priority) may offer a model.

2. Corrections and Probation work are both possibilities.

C. Other Items of Discussion

1. Length of Program
2. Core Courses
3. Practicum Agencies

Keynote: Flexibility

Second Discussion Session

Group 1.

Group Leader: Dr. Paul Woods, Hollins College, Va.
Group Recorder: Dr. Felicia A. Pryor, Louisiana State Univ., La.

Our group feels that MA trained people are psychologists by training and identity and that they should be granted full membership status in APA. Assuming that they have been broadly-trained at the BA level, the MA should be a professional degree program. These programs should be innovative and broadly based with consultants from many areas, including the consumers of these services. The trainers in these programs should not only be scientist-professional role models, but also social change agent models. The programs should be oriented to train the students in a problem-solving orientation which includes competency in data-collection and data-analysis skills. Since it was felt that the

trainers should be role models, it was felt that an apprenticeship program with close contact and interaction was important in the training and the core competencies of the MA psychologist. It was felt that this training should be broad and should be responsive to the needs of the community. Thus, it was felt that there should be no one program, but a variety of MA programs to produce this new variety of psychologist. However, since these people are trained as psychologists, it was felt that a core of competencies for the MA psychologist would include competency in such psychological methodologies as observation, statistics, the scientific method, and communication skills.

Group 2.

Group Leader: Dr. James M. Whitehouse, Drake Univ., Iowa
Group Recorder: Dr. Henry Tomes, Meharry Medical College, Tenn.

This group unanimously voted to go on record as being in favor of masters level psychologists being eligible for full membership in the Association. It was clear from the discussion that all rights and privileges of membership should be made available to MA level persons.

It was the impression that the likelihood of some psychologists leaving the Association was quite high, but that the absolute number would probably be quite low. Also, it was felt that inclusion of large numbers of masters level persons as members would probably speed the federation process which is now under discussion by P & P Board.

It was agreed by the group that the accrediting and certifying processes--i.e., who and what is a psychologist?--should be done at the local level. Programs providing masters psychologists should enter the certifying-licensing process on the side of their students. One example from the area of school psychology was given in which California programs have the responsibility for the credentialing of school psychologists.

The problems of certification, it was agreed, should be brought into focus with the need to certify and/or license MA psychologists as psychologists.

One issue which is quite likely to be raised is that of defining the set of competencies which constitutes a psychologist. At the present time much emphasis is placed on the level of education. A redesignation of who is a psychologist should have serious implication for the degree-oriented definition.

On the issue of training leading to competency at certain levels, there was agreement that research knowledge and skills courses should be included in all MA programs, but should be tied closely to its tool function to relate to meaningful human problems not as a sterile academic exercise. Additional competencies should be related to person-oriented skills such as facilitating communication, organizing people around meaningful issues and problems, etc. Emphasis was placed also on finding ways to apply research knowledge which, at this point, has not been applied.

Finally, the group wanted to determine a strategy to ensure that conference and task force deliberations would receive the fastest hearing possible and have a chance to be enacted. A convention meeting was proposed which Chuck Thomas indicated had been scheduled. The Council of Graduate Chairmen should be given an opportunity to react to these ideas. It is felt that some opposition may develop from this group.

In summary, this group of persons was in favor of doing away with the second class citizenship of the MA psychologists, of providing sound but meaningful educational experiences, and of influencing licensing and certification procedures at the local level. There were frequent expressions of a need to see that the various conferences and task forces reports "don't get lost" as has happened so many times before.

Group 3.

Group Leader: Dr. John F. Hale, Fort Lewis State College, Colo.
Group Recorder: Dr. Shalom E. Vineberg, Univ. of Houston, Tex.

MA is level at which properly trained professional can function.

--Skills and theoretical background can be built in.
--Diversity of objectives and programs must be respected.

Some two-trackedness should exist throughout psychology training.

--Including undergraduate, where the applications of psychology can be taught and practiced.

The concept of multiple entry involves, especially at undergraduate and at MA levels, the desirability of interdisciplinary programs.

--The implication is that there are many community jobs which profit from psychological background and skills, but are not exclusively psychology-based.
--Recognizes the need to include psychological training for students preparing to enter "non-psychological" professions, e.g., policemen, probation officers, teachers, hospital aides, community counselor and social service personnel.

Multiple-entry level possibilities make necessary the redesign of undergraduate psychology curriculum to include applied courses and practicum opportunities.

Professionally trained MA psychologists should be recognized as psychologists and have full membership in APA.

--Programs should be accredited.

1. Need and desirability does exist--programs would only enhance the role of Ph.D.

2. Should have full recognition:

   a. APA members
   b. Undergraduate practice
   c. Admission to college teaching faculty.

3. Need to have additional conference on:

   a. This type--with master's people involved: those in programs, those in practice.
   b. Or the college-community interface. Can the college supply the public-community demand for services and maintain its role as keeper and seeker of knowledge for its own sake?

4. Such programs need to be critically evaluated--and so must the entire system of psychology education, up to and including a Ph.D.

Group 4.

Group Leader: Dr. Robert B. Kurz, Office of Educational Affairs
Group Recorder: Dr. Judith Cates, Research Associate, Manpower Studies, Office of Educational Affairs

The group, by unanimous vote, proposes the following resolutions to the conference:

1. Master's level psychologists should be eligible for full membership in the APA.

2. The APA should support a policy of federal funding for master's programs by institutional grants and/or individual stipends or loans.

3. The APA should develop a system of advisory review for Masters level programs in all their diversity. The review should include feedback from the consuming public. In the meantime, the APA-NSF Visiting Scientist and other such programs should be utilized to provide consultation to Master's programs, and a list of Master's level programs should be published.

CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS

The participants were asked to vote on the resolutions proposed by Group 4. The first resolution passed without a dissenting vote. There were, however, two abstentions.

The second resolution passed with no opposition, but one abstention.

The third resolution, containing several points, was discussed at length. The resolution passed with only a few negative votes and abstentions.

At this point, the participants were asked to vote to endorse the statement which emerged from the prior conference in Atlanta, Georgia. The statement is as follows:

> To meet the problem of coping with an increasingly stressful environment, the American public urgently needs a corps of effective applied behavioral scientists. Development of programs leading to a professional master's degree in psychology, directed toward the practical utilization of research findings, is one way in which American psychology can help to meet this need. Such a master's degree should be focused upon the attainment of competence in basic applicable principles of behavioral science, and in reality skills that equip the recipient to apply these principles and skills to the problems of the community. Since the requirements of different communities vary, no specific guidelines for content of the master's program should be established; instead, program innovation and flexibility, responsive to the needs of the community and the time, should be encouraged. The people who are trained in these programs, which are intended specifically to produce effective social change agents, should be recognized as the full-fledged professionals they are.

There was considerable discussion focused around two major points. The first point was that the Atlanta statement was more abstract than the resolutions already passed, and endorsement might dilute the impact of the resolutions. This was countered by the suggestion that both the resolutions and the endorsement of the earlier statement would be a part of the record. In essence, the purpose was to add support to the Atlanta statement, even though the San Diego resolutions were more specific. The second point focused on specifics of the language of the Atlanta statement. The primary concern was with the phrases "full-fledged professionals" and "social change agents," but individual participants also resisted some other specifics. It was pointed out that the primary purpose of the conference was to assess the sentiment of those "in the field" to enable the APA Task Force to act in accord with the wishes of the majority in reporting back to the APA. While there was resistance to specifics, it was clear that the conference was generally in agreement with the Atlanta statement. It was finally suggested that the issue for vote be altered. The following was proposed:

> "As a reflection of our general agreement with the intent and principles exhibited by the statement of the Atlanta group, the WICHE conference offers the following resolutions (already passed as above) as a means of implementing and interpreting the Atlanta statement."

The vote was unanimously in favor.

PARTICIPANT LIST

	Group
Dr. C. Eugene Mallory, Chairman Psychology Department Whittier College Whittier, California 90608	1
Dr. Spanier Psychology Department Stanislaus State College Turlock, California	2
Dr. Peter Ciklic Psychology Department Loyola University of Los Angeles Los Angeles, California 90045	3
Dr. Irving Kessler Psychology Department Loyola University of Los Angeles Los Angeles, California 90045	4
Nora Weckler Psychology Department San Fernando Valley State College Northridge, California 91324	1
Ed Reynolds Psychology Department San Fernando Valley State College Northridge, California 91324	2
Robert Penn, Ph.D., Chairman Psychology Department San Diego State College San Diego, California	3
Dr. Richard H. Schulte Department of Psychology San Diego State College San Diego, California	4
Dr. William A. Hunrichs Department of Psychology San Diego State College San Diego, California	1

PARTICIPANT LIST (Cont.)

	Group
Dr. Patsy H. Sampson, Chairman Department of Psychology California State College Bakersfield, California 93309	2
Dr. David C. Cohen Psychology Department California State College Bakersfield, California 93309	3
Dr. Steven E. Suter Department of Psychology California State College Bakersfield, California 93309	4
Dr. Phil Sutherland Psychology Department Biola College La Mirada, California 90638	1
Dr. Gene A. Wallar Psychology Department San Jose State College San Jose, California 95114	2
Dr. Gerald Sperrazzo Psychology Department University of San Diego San Diego, California 92110	3
Stephen S. Rauch, Chairman Department of Psychology San Francisco State College San Francisco, California 94132	4
Dr. Nathan Shenfeld Psychology Department Occidental College Los Angeles, California 90041	1
Dr. Ernest H. Dondis Psychology Department California State College Fullerton, California 92631	2

PARTICIPANT LIST (Cont.)

	Group
Dr. Leonard Pearson Psychology Department Sonoma State College Rohnert Park, California 94928	3
Dr. Arthur Warmoth Psychology Department Sonoma State College Rohnert Park, California 94928	4
Esther Lee Muniow, Chairman Psychology Department Mills College Oakland, California 94613	1
John Haralson, Ph.D., Acting Chairman Department of Psychology California State College Los Angeles, California 90032	2
Dr. Gene Thompson Psychology Department California Baptist College Riverside, California 92504	3
Dr. Samuel S. Franklin Department of Psychology Fresno State College Fresno, California 93726	4
Dr. Alan Lowenthal Department of Psychology California State College Long Beach, California 90801	1
Dr. Janice Erskine Department of Psychology Humboldt State College Arcata, California 95521	2
Dr. Phil Mohan Department of Psychology Humboldt State College Arcata, California 95521	3

PARTICIPANT LIST (Cont.)

	Group
Dr. L. Ralph Chason, Major United States Air Force Assistant Professor and Director of Laboratories Department of Psychology and Leadership USAF Academy, Colorado 80840	4
Dr. Vern K. Kupfer, Chairman Department of Psychology Southern Utah State College Cedar City, Utah 84720	1
Dr. John F. Hale, Chairman Psychology Department Fort Lewis College Durango, Colorado	2
Dr. Joseph D. Liggit Psychology Department Box 6002 N.A.U. Northern Arizona University Flagstaff, Arizona 86001	3
Dr. Donald D. Megenity Psychology Department Southern Colorado State College Pueblo, Colorado 81005	4
Dr. Rich Psychology Department Central Washington State College Ellensburg, Washington 98926	1
Dr. James M. Whitehouse Department of Psychology Drake University Des Moines, Iowa	2
Dr. Theodore Franklin Behavioral Sciences New Mexico Highland University Las Vegas, New Mexico 87701	3
Dr. Joel D. West Department of Psychology Northern Michigan University Marquette, Michigan 49855	4

APA Task Force on Sub-Doctoral Education

	Group
Dr. Charles Thomas 5702 Bowesfield Los Angeles, California	1
Dr. Felicia A. Pryor Department of Chemistry University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	2
Dr. Henry Tomes Meharry Medical College Nashville, Tennessee 37208	3
Dr. William Verplanck Department of Psychology University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37916	4
Dr. Shalom E. Vineberg Department of Psychology University of Houston Houston, Texas 77004	1
Dr. Paul Woods Department of Psychology Hollins College Roanoke, Virginia 24020	2
Mr. Dan Payne, Director Mental Health Manpower Office Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education Boulder, Colorado 80302	

APA Representatives

Dr. Judith Cates Office of Educational Affairs American Psychological Association 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036	3

APA Representatives (Cont.)

	Group
Dr. Mike Wertheimer Office of Educational Affairs American Psychological Association Washington, D.C. 20036	4
Dr. Ray Vorus American Psychological Association Washington, D.C. 20036	3
Dr. Ron Kurz American Psychological Association Washington, D.C. 20036	4

Federal Agency Representatives

Dr. Howard Kramer National Institute of Mental Health Chevy Chase, Maryland	2
Dr. Robert Callahan National Science Foundation Washington, D.C.	1

WICHE Staff

Mr. Dan Payne, Director
Mental Health Manpower Office
Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Mr. Jerry Volgenau
Public Information Officer
Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Jodi Kelley, Secretary
Mental Health Manpower Office
Western Interstate Commission for
Higher Education
Boulder, Colorado 80302